



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/771,312 | 01/26/2001 | Aya Jakobovits | 511582000100 | 7650 |
| 36327 | 7590 | 10/31/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| AGENSYS C/O MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE SUITE 100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040 | | | FETTEROLF, BRANDON J | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1642 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 09/771,312 | Applicant(s) JAKOBOVITS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD | Art Unit 1642 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED _____ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 12, 14, 15 and 39.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☒ Other: PTO-892.

Response to the Amendment

The Amendment filed on 9/28/2006 in response to the previous Final Office Action (6/28/2006) is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are currently pending and under consideration

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Rejections Maintained:

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 **remain** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 are directed to an isolated recombinant protein comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, wherein the recombinant protein is encoded by a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1. However, neither the specification nor any art of record teaches what the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 is, how it functions, or a specific and well-established utility as claimed. The specification asserts (page 15, lines 28-29 and page 16, lines 1-18) that the polypeptides of the invention can be utilized to generate antibodies for use in detecting 84P2A9 overexpression or the metastasis of prostate cells and/or cells of other cancers expressing the gene. Thus, it is presumed that there is a correlation between the overexpression of the polypeptide and a particular disease state. Furthermore, the specification teaches (page 18, lines 15-17) that the proteins of the invention may also be used in the forensic analysis of tissues of unknown origin.

The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-tumor activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" to the chemical arts when this term is given its broadest interpretation. However, the court held that this broad interpretation was not the intended

Art Unit: 1642

definition of “useful” as it appears in 35 U.S.C. §101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediately apparent or fully disclosed “real world” utility. The court held that:

The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. . . . [u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where *specific* benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field. . . . a patent is not a hunting license. . . . [i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.

Although the specification discloses a nexus between the polynucleotide expression and a disease state (see for example page 75, Example 3), the specification does not disclose a correlation between any specific disorder and an altered level or form of the claimed polypeptide. If a molecule such as the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 is to be used as a surrogate for a disease state, some disease state must be identified in some way with the molecule. There must be some expression pattern that would allow the claimed polypeptide to be used in a diagnostic manner. Many polypeptides may be expressed in normal tissues, as well as diseased tissues. Therefore, one needs to know, e.g., that the claimed polypeptide is present only in cancer tissue to the exclusion of normal tissue. Thus, in the absence of any correlation between the claimed polypeptide with any known disease or disorder, any information obtained from various expression profiles in both normal and diseased tissue only serves as the basis for further research on the observation itself.

Furthermore, those of skill in the art recognize that over expression of a particular nucleic acid specific for a tissue type, does not necessarily correlate nor predict equivalent levels of polypeptide expression. There are many steps in the pathway leading from DNA to protein, and all of them can, in principle, be regulated. For example, Alberts *et al.* (Molecular Biology of the Cell, 3rd edition, 1994, page 465) illustrate post-transcriptional regulation of ferritin wherein the translation of ferritin mRNA into ferritin polypeptide is blocked during periods of iron starvation. Likewise, if excess iron is available, the transferrin receptor mRNA is degraded and no transferrin receptor polypeptide is translated. Lewin, B. also teaches (Genes VI, Oxford University Press, Inc., NY, Chapter 29, 1997) that a major control point for genes exists during the initiation of transcription by the interaction of the RNA polymerase with its promoter. Concurring with Alberts *et al.*, Lewin

Art Unit: 1642

further acknowledges downstream control of gene expression since translation of mRNA in the cytoplasm is also a point of control. Also, with regards to tumor associated antigens, Fu et al (EMBO Journal, 1996, Vol. 15, pp. 4392-4401) teach that levels of p53 protein expression do not correlate with levels of p53 mRNA levels in blast cells taken from patients with acute myelogenous leukemia, said patients being without mutations in the p53 gene. Furthermore, Mallampalli *et al.* (Biochem. J. Vol. 318, 1996, pages 333-341) teach that the glucocorticoid, betamethasone, increased mRNA expression of cholinephosphate cytidylyltransferase (CT) as determined by RT-PCR and Southern analysis, but did not alter the levels of the CT enzyme as assayed by Western blotting (abstract, and page 339, 2nd column, 2nd paragraph). Finally, Lewin acknowledges that control of gene expression can occur at multiple stages and that production of RNA *cannot inevitably* be equated with production of protein. Thus, the predictability of protein translation and its possible utility as a diagnostic are not necessarily contingent on the levels of mRNA expression due to the multitude of homeostatic factors affecting transcription and translation. Therefore, absent evidence of the polypeptide expression including the correlation to a diseased state, one of skill in the art would not be able to predictably use the invention in a way that constitutes a specific and substantial utility and as disclosed do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 as being useful.

Claims 12, 14-15 and 39 also **remain** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

In response to the rejection, Applicants contend that they have asserted a specific, substantial utility-namely, that of indicating and treating prostate cancer. For example, Applicants assert that the claimed polypeptide is a marker on cancerous prostate cancer cells and is useful as a therapeutic target for antibodies directed against such cancer cells. Thus, Applicants assert that this utility is indeed specific to the polypeptide claimed and not applicable to a broad range of inventions, which may or may not be expressed by cancerous prostate cells. Moreover, Applicants contend that like the example given in the MPEP, the claimed polypeptide has been correlated to a specific disease condition, prostate cancer. In fact, Applicants assert that the claimed polypeptide has been demonstrated, in the form of mRNA expression, to be detectable on prostate cancer cells; and further, detectable on the surface of prostate cancer cells by antibodies specific to the claimed

Art Unit: 1642

protein, which shows that Applicants' asserted utility is specific and substantial (see Dr. Morrison's Declaration submitted on October 12, 2005). Moreover, Applicants contend that the claimed protein does not need to distinguish between cancerous and healthy prostate cancer cells. For example, Applicants assert that all that needs to be shown is that the protein is expressed at all on cancerous prostate cell for the claimed protein to be useful because once a diagnosis of prostate cancer is made the elimination of cancerous prostate cells becomes a paramount interest. Thus, Applicants contend that the asserted utility is also substantial because it provides a "real world use" for the claimed subject matter as a means for producing a treatment for prostate cancer. For example, Applicants contend that the specification teaches the effects of an antibody alone or labeled with toxins, radioisotopes, or other chemotherapeutic agents for inhibiting the growth of prostate cancer cells expressing the claimed protein (Specification, page 56, line 1 to page 60, line 8). Applicants further assert that like the claimed compound in *Brana*, the protein claimed here provides a plausible target for anti-cancer treatments namely by monoclonal antibodies, wherein treating cancer with monoclonal antibodies "does not suggest an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involve implausible scientific principles." In addition, Applicants contend that the Office has not made a *prima facie* case of showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt that the claimed protein is useful as a therapeutic agent. In contrast, Applicants submit that only a single specific and substantial utility is needed to satisfy the requirement of the statute.

These arguments have been carefully considered, but are not found persuasive.

In response to Applicants assertions that the claimed polypeptide can be correlated to prostate cancer, the Examiner acknowledges that prostate cancer cells have shown mRNA expression, as well as, that the claimed protein can be detected on prostate cancer cells using immunohistochemistry. However, the Examiner recognizes that the mere fact that a polypeptide is present on prostate cancer cells does not necessarily mean that there is a correlation between the claimed polypeptide and prostate cancer cells. For example, if a molecule such as the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 is to be used as a surrogate for a disease state, there must be some expression pattern that would allow the claimed polypeptide to be correlated to a particular disease because many polypeptides and polynucleotides may be expressed in normal tissues, as well as diseased tissues (see Specification page 76, lines 1-5 and Fig. 6). In response to Applicants contention that utility is also substantial because it provides a "real world use" for the claimed subject matter as a

Art Unit: 1642

means for producing a treatment for prostate cancer, the Examiner acknowledges that Applicants assert that the protein claimed provides a plausible target for anti-cancer treatments namely by monoclonal antibodies. However, as noted in the previous office action, the Examiner does not see a difference in being a target for treating cancerous prostate cancer cells and being a diagnostic for prostate cancer cells because there still needs to be some type of expression pattern that would allow the claimed polypeptide to be useful as a "target" on prostate cancer cells vs. normal prostate cells and/or any other normal tissue. Moreover, the Examiner recognizes that treating cancer using monoclonal antibodies at the time the invention was filed is not as trivial as Applicants assert. For example, Weiner (Seminars Oncology, Vol. 26, No.4, 1999, pages 41-50) provided an overview of monoclonal antibody of therapy including some promising activity, however major obstacles to clinical efficacy still exist extending the unpredictability of this treatment. This includes impaired distribution and delivery of antibody to the tumor site, inadequate trafficking of potential cellular effectors to tumor, antigenic heterogeneity, shed or internalized targets, insufficient target specificity, and induction of HAMA (page 43). The above obstacles are further compounded by the fact that, in this case, the target (SEQ ID NO: 2) has not been correlated specifically with prostate cancer. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the field of oncology would not expect that the claimed polypeptide could be used as a "target" to effectively treat a prostate tumor because the treatment would also destroy healthy, normal cells.

In view of this, it is the Examiners opinion that the Office has made a *prima facie* showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt that the claimed protein is useful.

All other previous rejections and/or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.

Conclusion

Therefore, No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.


Art Unit: 1642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF


JEFFREY SIEW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER